

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-4 are pending before the Examiner. Claims 3 and 4 have been amended. Support for the amendments may at least be found in the specification, claims and Figures as originally filed. The specification has been amended to replace the Abstract. Support for the Abstract may at least be found on pages 4 through 5 of Applicants' specification. No new matter has been introduced as a result of these amendments.

The Examiner has objected to the Information Disclosure Statement filed on May 25, 2000 for failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.98(a)(2).

The Examiner has objected to the Specification and specifically the Abstract under §608.01(b) of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

Objection to Information Disclosure Statement under 37 C.F.R.

§1.98(a)(2)

The Examiner has objected to the Information Disclosure Statement filed on May 25, 2000 for failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. §1.98(a)(2).

Applicants would like to thank Examiner Abeebe for clarifying the present rejection. Examiner Abeebe explained to Applicant that when he received the above-referenced patent application a copy of the Information Disclosure Statement and references cited therein was not included. Applicants resubmitted the Information Disclosure Statement on June 29, 2005 pursuant to Examiner Abeebe's request along with a copy of the stamped return postcard from the United States Patent Office verifying receipt of the Information Disclosure Statement on May 25, 2000.

Objection to the Specification under MPEP §608.01(b)

The Examiner has objected to the Specification and specifically the Abstract under §608.01(b) of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure.

Applicants have made an amendment to replace the original Abstract with a new Abstract that complies with the requirements of §608.01(b) of the MPEP.

In light of the foregoing amendment, Applicants

respectfully request the Examiner withdraw the objection to the Specification under §608.01(b) of the MPEP and find the amendments in compliance with §608.01(b).

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph

The Examiner has rejected claim 1-4 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention.

In framing his objection, the Examiner stated the following:

"The claims generally fail to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal copy of a foreign document and include a language other than English. Please remove all foreign words (consonants) from the claims

Claim 3 recites the limitation "the remaining constants" in lines 3, 4, 6-9 and 11. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. Correction is required."

(Office Action dated 5/13/2005; page 2)

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's position. Applicants have called Examiner Abeebe to discuss the

merits of this rejection. However, Examiner Abeebe has not returned any of Applicants' telephone calls.

Applicants' independent claim 1 recites a method directed to comparing similarity between phonetic transcriptions of foreign words. The foreign words recited as claim elements in Applicants claims 1-4 describe the claimed method for *comparing similarity between phonetic transcriptions of foreign words* (emphasis added). One of ordinary skill in the art need only read Applicants' claims in light of the specification to recognize this fact. For these reasons, Applicants believe the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph is without merit and should be withdrawn.

In light of the foregoing remarks, Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and find the subject matter of claims 1-4 allowable.

CONCLUSION

It is believed the following remarks and publications attached hereto comply with the Examiner's requests. If the Examiner has any questions or feels that a telephone or personal interview would be helpful in resolving any outstanding issues, the Examiner is courteously invited to telephone the undersigned and the same would be greatly appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,

KEY-SUN CHOI

By 

Ross J. Christie

Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 47,492

Tel: (203) 777-6628

Fax: (203) 865-0297

Date: August 9, 2005

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: "Mail Stop Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22317" on August 9, 2005


Ross J. Christie